

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

Claims 18 to 22, 24 to 30 and 32 to 40 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper and cited references.

### **II. Allowed Claims**

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 18 to 22, 24 to 30, and 32 to 38 have been allowed.

### **II. Rejection of Claim 39 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,155,364 (“Nagano”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,950,797 (“Aulanko”). While Applicant does not agree with the merits of this rejection, to facilitate matters, claim 39 has been amended herein to include features analogous to those of allowed claim 18. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Nagano and Aulanko does not render unpatentable claim 39 because, as more fully set forth in Applicant’s response of February 27, 2008, Aulanko does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 18 now included in claim 39. Nagano does not cure the critical deficiencies of Aulanko with regard to these features. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Nagano and Aulanko does not render unpatentable claim 39 as presented.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claim 40 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of European Published Patent Application No. 1 231 701 (“Ohnuma”) and Aulanko. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ohnuma and Aulanko does not render unpatentable claim 40 for at least the following reasons.

TheFinal Office Action asserts that control circuit 410 of Ohnuma is adapted to modulate or demodulate information onto load leads (wiring 60) that supply the motor. However, Ohnuma discloses only that control circuit 410 outputs a control signal and that drive circuit 420 supplies power to armature 2 (via wiring 60) according to the control signal. (see Ohnuma at paragraph 87). There is no mention whatsoever by Ohnuma that control circuit 410 modulates or demodulates information onto load leads that supply power to a motor. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ohnuma and Aulanko does not render unpatentable claim 40.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 29, 2008  
By: /  
Clifford A. Ulrich  
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
CUSTOMER NO. 26646